10/14/66

Dear Hal,

A few further words. Fonzi's is a good story. Vince worked on him with it, especially at the archive and on the double exposures of the stills. He told us about it on the Jack McKinney show on WCAU the night he and Curtis Crawford ~~was~~ were with me, back in July. When I saw the piece I was disappointed that all the books and articles, including those not yet out, were mentioned except mine, which has more of what Fonzi was after than any. It is an important contribution. More so in its own way is the US News thing, Time will show. His "willingness" to reopen is the least of it.

The National Review thing is not odd when you consider that as a trustee of the Kohlburg Foundation Buckley anted up $2,000 for the beginning of such a private re-investigation. I've been approached, which is odd, and Sylvia is under consideration. I strongly supported this suggestion.

I cannot really say what all this means. One thing is conspicuous: the recent attention has been to those books assuming Oswald's guilt. Balancing against LIFE is a weaker thing in time. LIFE ignored the strength of the criticism; TIME clobbered it, as I recall.

What you say on #958 is quite interesting and may ultimately be important. It would seem to explain the classification of #959. Your deductions are consistent with what I believe and have from the first believed about Oswald. And what you say about the FBI reports is typical of the way they are drafted, as though separate ones were filed for those who really should get the poop.

I had never seen the Fulbright statement. I'm pleased that he made it for I spent some time on the Hill and spoke at some length to his legislative asst. I am also surprised that Bantam printed the name of my book. If I find its source I'll send you a copy. What you project on collecting the statements is interesting and should serve a useful purpose. The British Sunday papers of 9/25 all had much. L'Europeo, the Italian LIFE, interviewed me and had a story in the 9/15 issue that seems to be the lead story. I have a copy and will seek to get it translated. The London Sunday Times of 10/9 had a long magazine piece and a news story. The French Radio System is going to do a big anniversary thing. Its chief editor, who seems like a very decent fellow, had a long talk with me last night or the night before. You know about as much as I of the US press, maybe more, for I've not followed it as much as I should in my own interest because I've been too busy writing and performing some of the publishing function.

If those Ramparts character send me a couple of advance copies I can place them in Washington where it might do them some good.

Paul's LIFE thing is quite interesting. I am surprised to find he was working with Popkin, something he didn't tell me when I helped him a little. I have with good fortune obtained a single copy of the Memorial edition. I'll keep my eyes peeled and maybe one of the other inquiries will bear fruit.

For the moment I can say and do nothing about the new book. The rough draft is in the hands of a publisher who has first refusal on it. It also needs editing.

On Liebeler, I think you'll find an answer in the new book. On altgens, no, I do not know Altgens's position. I think real photo experts can plot it with great accuracy. I cannot. I use it with specified limitations. I think those who have placed it, like Marcus, have not made their own errors. That is what Liebeler seems to me to have wanted, an indefinite positioning.

Lillian's work is spectacular. She has seen things that I have not yet seen. Even after she has told me of some of it I do not see it. I had seen some odd things in 10 but do not recall what. I also seem to recall wanting to make a closer study of 6. What you say about 2323 and Willis 8 is true. But may I ask you what you think of the height of the man in Willis 8. If he is not standing on something is he not too tall for Ruby. Otherwise, what you say, to the creases, does check out. And it would be a simple matter to check Ruby's clothing. I am also inclined to agree with you on the man Lane implies is Ruby. Note that I have made nothing of it although the superficial resemblance can be made out on the cropped version. I had

not before noticed what you point out about the man in #10 and what seems to be the case in the indistinct print, of the handkerchief. Offhand I'd be inclined to believe these are plain-clothes police of various kinds and that the suits are too dark, but I am not certain. The man in the foreground of 8 is wearing a reddish-brown suit. I just checked the Willis slides. In color he does not seem to be as bald. On what I detected in 5, please let that wait until you see it in print.

I do not dispute your belief for the reason behind the suppression of the pictures you list. I am more inclined to believe there are other things in those and the numerous other ones not in the record or the evidence or the report on the files. I point this out in WHITEWASH.

The bibliography is available for $37.00 in Xerox or $8 on microfilm. I cannot offer to lend you mine for I have to refer to it too often.

The Tippit map, which in Xeroxed form I have difficulty reading, is consistent with what Penn Jones has told me, including mention of his presence at a gas station on the highway.

What prints do you mean in your PS? If it is anything I can get for you or do, I'll be glad to.

Have you any theory for the distortion in #2424?

Thanks for what you have done. Please, as you have been keep me posted on what appears in the papers out there. I wish it were possible to do more by radio again. That was helpful. Metromedia has taped a special with Penn, Sauvage, Cohen, Lane, Jim Bishop and me to be aired for 3 hrs. the night of ~~11/11~~ 11/12 on their own TV stations, including LA. I do not know whether they have a TV station in SF. They are impressed with it, and I agree from my recollection of it.

Sincerely,